images". Additionally, dependent Claims 5-6, 13 and 16-17 have been amended to correspond to the newly added "indica of internal file characteristics" language of independent Claims 1, 7 and 12. Support for these claims changes can be found in the Specification as originally filed at least at page 2, lines 16-22 and page 6, line 32 to page 7, line 4.

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps (Figs. 1-9, 1994).

Regarding Claims 1 and 7, the Examiner, relying on Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Fig. 2, states that the "Quick View pop-up window...enables users to open, and display the internal contents of a file, e.g., color-type, graphics, font etc, without opening an application program in the computer's memory)".

Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Fig. 2 does disclose a user interface for opening, and displaying the internal contents of a file (see Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Fig. 3), but not for displaying "indicia of internal file characteristics separate from the file image" as recited in Claim 1 (as now amended). The "contents" of the file accessed and displayed by Quick View is the display image itself, not including any indica of internal file characteristics (see Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Fig. 3). Nowhere does Quick View display an indicia of internal file characteristics, such as "height, width, length, color type, resolution, compression type used for storing and forming the file, and annotation graphics of the file". For example, referring to Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Fig. 3, a person viewing that image could count the pixels used to display it and determine the resolution of the image, but that process is distinguishable from displaying an "indicia of internal file characteristics separate from the file image" (e.g., a text caption reciting "Resolution: 1024x768"). Determining internal characteristics inherent in a displayed image is different, and patently distinguishable from, reciting (in a screen view) indicia of those same internal characteristics.

Additionally, some internal file characteristics of an image are not discernable from simply viewing the image. In those cases a "recitation of indicia of internal file characteristics separate from the file image" is required to elucidate internal file characteristics. For example, the fact that an internal compression technique was used to reduce the size of the image when stored on disk is not discernable by viewing the image, but would be apparent by a "recitation of indicia of internal file characteristics separate from the file image".

Claims 2-5 are dependent on independent Claim 1 and Claims 8-9 are dependent on independent Claim 7. Based upon the arguments above, independent Claims 1 and 7 are believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art. Therefore, Claims 2-5 and 8-9 are also believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art by virtue of the fact that they depend from a patentably distinguishable base claim.

Additionally, regarding dependent Claim 5, the Examiner states that Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Fig. 8 provide an "indication of internal file characteristics (the compression type of Winzip file '4, 8-5, 5, 99' at the bottom of Fig. 8)." In fact, in the example of Fig. 8, the compression type is actually being derived from an external file characteristic (i.e., the file extension being ".ZIP"), not an internal file characteristic. For example, if the file extension of the "4, 8-5, 5, 99" file were changed to ".WPD" the indication as shown on Fig. 8 would no longer indicate that the file was a "WinZip file", but rather that it was a "WordPerfect Document", even though the compression algorithm, and the contents of the file itself never changed. A "recitation of indicia of internal file characteristics separate from the file image" according to the present invention is not tied to the file extension, and does not have to show a change simply based upon a file extension change.

In a similar regard the Examiner states that "Fig. 7 Windows NT teaches the indication of file compression, and type of compression used in forming the file (i.e., "zip" etc), color type (i.e., black & white or color)". Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Fig. 7 does not show internal file characteristics, and specifically does not show type of compression or color type. Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Fig. 7 shows external file characteristics, such as file name/extensions. As discussed above file extensions are not a reliable source of indica of internal file characteristics (e.g., .ZIP may not indicate a compressed file). Additionally, there is no indication of color type for the bitmap image "DFFINTRO.BMP" shown in Fig. 7.

Therefore, for the above-stated reasons, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-5 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 10-11, 13 and 15 remain, and Claims 12, 14 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps (Figs. 1-9, 1994).

Regarding independent Claim 12. The Examiner states that "Windows NT Explorer discloses...enabling display of internal file characteristics...". For similar reasons as stated in the

argument relating to Claim 1 and 7 above, Windows NT Explorer does not disclose displaying "indicia of internal file characteristics separate from the file image" as recited in Claim 12 (as now amended).

The Examiner notes that Windows NT Explorer does not disclose "the step of *displaying a working image* together with the indication of file characteristics, however it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the steps of *displaying working images* with *file characteristics* to save time in opening up several windows."

But, given the obvious advantage of "sav[ing] time in opening up several windows" Windows NT Explorer choose to implement both features (i.e., displaying working images and file characteristics) using separate windows. Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Figs. 1-9 use separate programs to implement each of the features (i.e., displaying working images and file characteristics). The file characteristics are displayed using "Properties" functionality inherent in Windows NT Explorer, whereas the image viewing is achieved using viewer technology from "Outside In Viewer Technology".

Claim 6 is dependent on independent Claim 1, Claims 10-11 are dependent on independent Claim 7, and Claims 13-17 are dependent on independent Claim 12. Based upon the arguments above, independent Claims 1, 7 and 12 are believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art. Therefore, Claims 6, 10-11, and 13-17 are also believed to be patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art by virtue of the fact that, if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Therefore, for the above-stated reasons, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 6 and 10-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

In paragraph 11 of the current Office Action the Examiner states the "Windows Explorer Quick View" teaches the limitation of "displaying internal file characteristics and displaying the internal file characteristics and file image". Windows Explorer Quick View as disclosed in Figs. 1-3 of the current Office Action discloses similar functionality as is described in Windows NT Explorer 4.0 screen dumps Figs. 1-9, and therefore also fails to teach all the limitations of the present invention as discussed above regarding independent Claims 1, 7 and 12. Therefore the present invent is patently distinguishable from Windows Explorer Quick View as disclosed in Figs. 1-3 of the current Office Action.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims (Claims 1-17) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (781) 861-6240.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By C. Steven Kurlowecz

C. Steven Kurlowecz
Registration No. 46,846
Telephone (781) 861-6240
Facsimile (781) 861-9540

Lexington, Massachusetts 02421-4799
Dated: 10/31/00